DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 423 SP 025 431

AUTHOR Feiman-Nemser, Sharon; Floden, Robert E.
TITLE The Cultures of Teaching. Occasional Paper No. 74.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 84
CONTRACT 400-81-0014
NOTE 80p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, E. Lansing, MI 48824 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Job Satisfaction; *Life Satisfaction; Locus of Control; Need Gratification; Personality Traits; Professional Recognition; *Psychological Needs; Self Concept; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching (Occupation); *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In the past, many social scientists were content to study teaching from a distance, borrowing concepts mainly from psychology and sociology to explain what teaching was like. Increasingly, students of teaching have come to value the insider's viewpoint and to rely on teachers as informants. This paper brings together research about the meaning of teaching to teachers and the origins of those meanings. It is organized around three questions: (1) What is known about the cultures of teaching? (2) What is known about the origins of those cultural patterns? and (3) What is known about how teachers acquire a cultural repertoire in teaching? Also discussed are obstacles to studying the cultures of teaching and implications for teacher education and policy. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Feiman-Nemser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Occasional Paper No. 74

THE CULTURES OF TEACHING

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and
Robert E. Floden

Institute
for
Research on Teaching

Occasional Paper No. 74

THE CULTURES OF TEACHING

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and
Robert E. Floden

Published By

The Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

July 1984

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-81-0014)

Institute for Research on Teaching

The **Institute for Research on Teaching** was founded at Michigan State University in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. Following a nationwide competition in 1981, the NIE awarded a second contract to the IRT, extending work through 1984. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations for individual research projects.

The IRT conducts major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and teacher education. IRT researchers are also examining the teaching of specific school subjects such as reading, writing, general mathematics, and science, and are seeking to understand how factors outside the classroom affect teacher decision making.

Researchers from such diverse disciplines as educational psychology, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy cooperate in conducting IRT research. They join forces with public school teachers, who work at the IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, analyze and interpret results, and disseminate findings.

The IRT publishes research reports, occasional papers, conference proceedings, a newsletter for practitioners, and lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, and/or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the IRT Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Associate Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Richard S. Prawat

Editorial Staff
Editor: Janet Eaton
Assistant Editor: Patricia Nischan

Abstract

In the past, many social scientists were content to study teaching from a distance, borrowing concepts mainly from psychology and sociology to explain what teaching was like. Increasingly, students of teaching have come to value the insider's viewpoint and to rely on teachers as informants. This paper, prepared as a chapter for the *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (third edition), draws together research about the meaning of teaching to teachers and the origins of those meanings. It is organized around three questions: (1) What is known about the cultures of teaching? (2) What is known about the origins of those cultural patterns? and (3) What is known about how teachers acquire a cultural repertoire in teaching? We also discuss obstacles to studying the cultures of teaching and implications for teacher education policy and practice.

THE CULTURES OF TEACHING[1]

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Robert E. Floden[2]

In the *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Travers, 1973), Lortie (1973) calls attention to an "odd gap" in current knowledge about teachers: "We have too few studies which explore the subjective world of teachers in terms of *their* conceptions of what is salient" (p. 490). Lortie speculates that familiarity may have dulled researchers' curiosity about the way teachers perceive themselves and their occupational lives. A decade later, this chapter considers how well that gap has been closed by drawing together research about the meaning of teaching to teachers and the origins of those meanings.

The presence of a chapter in the third edition of the *Handbook of Research on Teaching* on the cultures of teaching suggests that some new ways of looking at teaching as work have emerged over the past two decades. Comparing our focus here with that of related chapters in previous handbooks (Charters, 1963; Lortie, 1973), one not only finds new areas of inquiry (e. g., teachers' practical knowledge), but new perspectives on familiar topics (e. g., what women teachers find rewarding in teaching). Most striking is a shift from trying to study the world of teaching as a public, social

---

[1]This paper will appear as a chapter in M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, third edition. New York, Macmillan, forthcoming.

[2]Sharon Feiman-Nemser is coordinator of the IRT's Knowledge Use in Learning to Teach Project. Robert Floden is a senior researcher with the IRT's Content Determinants and Conceptual Analytic Projects. Both are associate professors in MSU's Department of Teacher Education.

The authors wish to acknowledge the thoughtful and thorough critiques of their official reviewers, Arthur Wise, Kenneth Zeichner, and Lilian Katz. Margret Buchmann suggested a number of key ideas, particularly in the section on teachers' knowledge. Ursala Pinero directed us to unpublished studies of women who teach that figure prominently in the section on the feminization of teaching. Cheryl Rosean provided valuable bibliographic assistance.

phenomenon to trying to understand how teachers define their own work situations. The "cultures of teaching" is a convenient label for the research we discuss, even though neither our approach nor the research itself is predominantly anthropological.

In the past, many social scientists were content to study teaching from a distance, borrowing concepts mainly from psychology and sociology to explain what teaching was like. For example, in the preface to his book on the nature of teaching, Dreeben (1970) acknowledges that he has adopted "the perspective of a somewhat cold-eyed sociological observer looking in from the outside" (p. 5). Increasingly, however, students of teaching have come to value the insider's viewpoint and to rely on teachers as informants.

The importance of asking teachers to speak for themselves about the meaning of their work is demonstrated in Nelson's (in press) research on retired Vermont schoolteachers. While these teachers worked long hours for little pay, they saw themselves as missionaries, involved in an important educational and social undertaking. An outsider might have thought them exploited. Many of the studies we review here were conducted in an attempt to understand how teachers make sense of their work.

Public concern over the quality of teaching and the strong press to improve education through policy make research on the cultures of teaching particularly timely. For one thing, teachers often play the role of street-level bureaucrats (cf. Lipsky, 1980), influencing the actual implementation of policies. Knowledge about the cultures of teaching can inform predictions about how teachers are likely to respond to policy initiatives and guide efforts to shape those responses. Policies that enhance the conditions of teaching are also needed to attract and hold talented individuals and to support their best efforts. Knowledge about the cultures of teaching can help

in the formulation of such policies. Finally, the practical wisdom of competent teachers remains a largely untapped source of insights for the improvement of teaching. Uncovering that knowledge is a major task in research on the cultures of teaching and can lead to policies that build on what teachers know.

In drawing policy implications from this research, however, one must not confuse cultural description with prescription. It is one thing to maintain that certain norms and sentiments exist among teachers and seem adaptive to current realities. It is quite another to assume that these norms and sentiments are worthwhile and ought to be upheld and transmitted. For example, many teachers are reluctant to request help or to offer guidance without being asked. The norm of noninterference may be understandable in a system where shared problem solving rarely occurs and teachers are expected to work things out on their own. Still, this cultural standard limits the possibilities for stimulation, growth and collegial control.

There is not sufficient evidence to conclude that such a standard obtains among all teachers. In fact, the question of whether even a majority of teachers shares a common culture has not been answered. It is far more likely that many cultures exist in this occupation whose members work in small towns and big cities, rich schools and poor schools, and include novices and veterans at different levels of schooling. Researchers have only begun to explore the diversity of the cultures of teaching.

We have organized this paper around three questions that reflect the state of research on the cultures of teaching: (1) What is known about the cultures of teaching? (2) What is known about the origins of these cultural patterns? (3) What is known about how teachers acquire a cultural repertoire in teaching? In so doing, we bring together bodies of work that are rarely

related. We begin by discussing several methodological problems that arise in studying the cultures of teaching.

Obstacles to Studying the Cultures of Teaching

While all educational research is difficult, research on the cultures of teaching has special difficulties because of its elusive subject matter and the diversity of the teaching population. Because these conditions cannot be eliminated, researchers must consider their consequences in designing, conducting, and interpreting studies, and consumers of these studies must decide how much these problems cast doubt on the findings.

Three methodological problems have special significance for research on the cultures of teaching. First, the focus on *culture* implies inferences about knowledge, values and norms for action, none of which can be directly observed. Second, the existence of *many* teaching cultures raises difficult questions: Which culture or cultures does a study address? How can differences among cultures and similarities within cultures be documented? Third, researchers must neither evaluate a culture by inappropriate external standards, nor fall into the relativistic trap of asserting that every aspect of that culture is good. Judgment is unavoidable in research on the cultures of teaching, where pragmatic questions about directions for change are always in the minds of researchers and policy makers.

We illustrate each of these problems with studies discussed in subsequent sections. The illustrations show, not how the problems can be eliminated, but how researchers have dealt with them and the consequences.

Describing the Unseen

A central problem in research on the cultures of teaching is how to get inside teachers' heads to describe their knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and

values. The difficulties of basing these descriptions on observational data are obvious--the data do not provide any direct statement of what teachers think or feel. Merely asking teachers to tell what they know or find rewarding, however, cannot guarantee that self reports will capture the insider's perspective. Discounting the possibility of intentional deception, it is difficult to judge how accurately people report on their own perspectives (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). Even if people have access to accurate information about their mental lives, they may not be able to express that information clearly. We show how these difficulties affect research on the cultures of teaching by considering two of the three areas of cultural content to be discussed in this chapter: practical knowledge and occupational rewards.

Practical knowledge is difficult to describe. People often know how to do things without being able to state what they know. Furthermore, neither teachers nor researchers have an adequate vocabulary for describing practical knowledge, much of which is tacit. Philosophical and psychological talk of theories, propositions and concepts fits codified knowledge, not tacit knowledge. To date, researchers have not gone much beyond suggesting concepts to guide the study of practical knowledge.

If teachers are pressed to give general descriptions of themselves and their work, they often use the same language that social and behavioral scientists do. These abstract descriptions may be remembered from college courses or picked up as part of the vocabulary of educated people, but they do not express teachers' own perspectives (Lampert, 1981).

Choosing guiding concepts is particularly problematic in research on the cultures of teaching. Conclusions about the rewards in teaching linked to career advancement, for example, depend on how reward and career are conceptualized. Early research on careers built on assumptions developed in research

on businessmen (e. g., the assumption that a model career is an uninterrupted sequence of positions with ever-increasing responsibility). Biklen (1983) argues that these imported concepts do not accurately represent the way female teachers think about their careers. Lortie also attempts to uncover what teachers find rewarding by asking indirect questions (e. g., about occasions that make teachers feel especially proud). His inferences about occupational rewards are dependent on his assumptions about the relationship between rewards and pride.

There is no easy solution to the problem of selecting guiding concepts; concepts from academic disciplines may not capture the way teachers themselves think about their work, but teachers are seldom able to provide a set of concepts that covers a variety of situations. As Schwab (1959) has argued, the practical knowledge most appropriate for dealing with a specific teaching context will not be abstract or flexible enough to fit the variety of contexts experienced by other teachers.

Lampert (1981) directly addresses these difficulties of inference in her study of how teachers manage to teach despite the seeming contradictions that characterize their work. She met regularly with seven teachers involved as colleagues in a project designed to consider the usefulness of cognitive theory for their classroom work. Lampert was designated as a teacher advocate, responsible for seeing that the other researchers did not impose their psychological concepts on the group discussions. Forty-five meetings over the course of two school years plus interviews, informal visits to classrooms, and small-group meetings, gave Lampert many glimpses of teachers' "sedimented theories." Recognizing that the imposition of concepts from sociology or psychology could prevent her from describing teachers' dilemmas, she took steps to increase the chance that her formulations would be faithful to the teachers' own perceptions.

First, she used transcripts and tapes of the teachers' conversations in the research meetings as her primary source of data. By checking her interpretations against what the teachers actually said, she hoped to capture their perspectives. Second, she restricted her attention to themes that teachers repeatedly returned to over the year of the study. Because a theme emerged in a number of different contexts, Lampert could test her understanding in a broad range of situations. Third, Lampert drew on what she had learned about the teachers through interviews and classroom visits. She attempted to make her interpretations fit everything she knew about these individuals. Because teachers returned to their work after describing their thoughts, they had a chance to check what they said against their continuing classroom practice. Finally, Lampert consciously tried to identify with the teachers, rather than with an academic discipline.

These multiple checks do not ensure the accuracy of an interpretation. As Lampert acknowledges, interpretation is based on uncertain inferences beyond the data. Checking interpretations for internal consistency may distort perspectives that are actually inconsistent or even incoherent. Ultimately, the researcher forms the concepts that guide analysis.

Finding Common Threads in a Complex Carpet

It is tempting to assume that teachers share a uniform teaching culture. Given that assumption, any sample of teachers can be chosen for intensive investigation, with the comforting belief that the culture those teachers share is *the* culture of teaching. The assumption of cultural uniformity is, however, untenable. Teachers differ in age, experience, social and cultural background, gender, marital status, subject matter, specialization, wisdom, and ability. The schools in which they work also differ in many ways, as do the groups of students they teach. All these differences may lead to

differences in teaching culture. The problem facing the researcher is how to design studies and draw inferences in the light of this diversity.

Lortie (1975) bases his analysis of teaching on data from three separate studies: the Five Towns Interview Study, the Dade County Survey, and national surveys conducted by the National Education Association (NEA). The 94 teachers interviewed in the 1963 Five Towns Study represent a range of socio-economic settings and school grade levels in districts around the Boston area. The Dade County Survey collected data as part of a larger 1964 survey of the professional staff in Dade County, which Lortie claims is more representative of the national teaching population than most single districts. Lortie drew on NEA surveys from the period 1960 to 1971.

Lortie's primary analysis is based on themes derived from his interview data, which are checked against the survey studies. He generally avoids conclusions about their generalizability to the teaching population as a whole. He portrays his book, *Schoolteacher*, as an attempt to propose themes for further exploration, not as an effort to describe the relative frequency with which, for example, teachers get their primary rewards from the gratitude of returning students.

Thus Lortie addresses the problem of diversity in the teaching population through a combination of careful sample selection, cross checking against other samples, caution in claiming generality of results, and description and possible explanation of differences among different groups of teachers. For example, in discussing the rewards of teaching, he gives careful attention to differences between men and women, older and younger teachers, and married and single teachers.

While Lortie acknowledges diversity, he talks about teachers in general. Metz (1978), however, finds that diversity of teaching cultures is a central

factor in the explanation of authority and control in schools. She characterizes teachers in two junior-high schools as either "incorporative" or "developmental," roughly corresponding to the familiar distinction between those who emphasize teaching subjects and those who emphasize teaching children. In one school, with substantially greater student discipline problems, the teachers were sharply divided. The incorporative-developmental distinction coincided with other differences (e. g., age, style of dress, political beliefs). Metz explains the discipline problems in terms of the lack of a uniform teaching culture.

No studies of the culture of teaching can afford the large, nationally representative samples required for accurate description of every subculture. Researchers and their audiences are inevitably torn between the desire to draw general conclusions and the fear of moving beyond a relatively small sample.

That's How It Is, But Is That How It Should Be?

Early anthropological studies judged primitive cultures against the template of advanced societies. One reaction to this ethnocentrism was to deny the possibility of judging any culture by external standards. In its shorter history, research on the cultures of teaching has run a similar course. Early work criticized teaching for not measuring up to the medical standard (e. g., Lortie, 1975). Recent work runs the risk of glorifying teachers' beliefs simply because they are what teachers believe. Both extremes must be avoided if research on the cultures of teaching is to guide the improvement of teaching and learning.

Maintaining a middle ground, however, is difficult. It is hard to acknowledge the specific features of the teaching occupation without assuming that standing patterns of practice are desirable.

Consider Biklen's (1983) analysis of careers. Women teachers often quit their formal teaching jobs for a period of time so that they can raise a family. Biklen challenges Lortie's (1975) interpretation that teaching is careerless, because the interpretation rests on a corporate career model that does not fit women teachers. How then should female careers be evaluated?

Biklen describes two women teachers who followed the standard pattern of entry and exit from formal teaching positions. Both women believe they have been continuously engaged in a career that combines family responsibilities with public school teaching. Moreover, they claim that, even when they were not teaching, they still wanted to get back to the classroom.

Biklen accepts this positive assessment without argument, concluding that the two women "are highly committed to their occupations" and "display . . . consistent commitment to education" (pp. 26-27). Such a positive assessment requires justification; there may be good reasons to prefer teachers who consistently devote themselves to teaching.

In another example, Biklen provides the necessary justification. Some teachers in her study rejected promotions to administrative positions because they thought the quality of their work would suffer. These teachers placed their decision not to "advance" in their careers in a positive light; they did not view moving to an administrative position as a step up the career ladder. Biklen does not merely accept the teachers' positive assessment of their own actions. She gives reasons for calling these teachers idealistic, for example, they decided on the basis of "how they served the occupation rather than how the occupation could serve them" (p. 40).

Meeting the Methodological Challenge

The cultures of teaching are elusive. Because they vary across individuals, across schools, and over time, verbal descriptions often seem inadequate to capture them.

Still, we feel cautiously optimistic about the prospects for understanding the cultures of teaching. Researchers have come to terms with the inevitability of uncertain inference, and realize that such judgments are more illuminating than professions of ignorance. Acceptance of diversity has replaced the mistaken hope for universal generalizations with the more modest, but attainable plan to sketch the range of diversity and suggest tentative explanations (Sarason, 1982). Recognizing the difficulty in judging aspects of the cultures of teaching is the first step towards drawing implications that respect teachers as persons without automatically endorsing their perceptions as the basis for recommended change.

Cultural Description

Teaching cultures are embodied in the work-related beliefs and knowledge teachers share--beliefs about appropriate ways of acting on the job, rewarding aspects of teaching, and knowledge that enables teachers to do their work. In describing beliefs about appropriate ways of acting, we draw on studies of the norms that govern social interactions between teachers and other role groups (e. g., principals, parents). Literature on occupational rewards in teaching forms the basis for our discussion of teachers' beliefs in that area.

Many people, including some leading educational researchers, have questioned whether teachers possess special knowledge. Does every reasonably intelligent adult know as much about teaching as most teachers? Although the question of what is needed to function effectively as a member of a teaching culture seems central to descriptive research on the cultures of teaching, the groundwork is still being laid for research in this area.

In the following three sections, we discuss research that describes teachers' beliefs about norms for social interaction, teachers' views of the rewards in teaching, and teachers' personal, practical knowledge. Later

sections on the genesis and acquisition of teaching cultures consider why it is that teachers share beliefs and knowledge.

Norms for Interaction

Norms for interaction shape the way teachers perceive their work and especially the way they see their relationships with students, other teachers, school administrators (primarily the principal), and parents. Norms vary among different groups of teachers, and teachers within any group probably vary in how strictly they comply with a given norm. There is little research that describes or explains such variation. Below we discuss the norms that researchers most often do.

Interactions with students. Waller's (1932) classic study of the sociology of teaching emphasizes the teacher-student relationship. Waller sees the teacher as the authority figure in the classroom and argues that teachers who do not maintain their authority run into trouble quickly. At all times, the teacher must keep a distance from the students and maintain discipline. Teachers must demonstrate to those outside the classroom that students respect them.

More recent studies of teacher socialization return to these themes of authority and discipline as guiding principles in teachers' comportment toward students. Hoy and Rees (1977) found that student teachers come to see student control as a primary goal in teaching, a goal that different teachers achieve in different ways. Ryan's (1970) accounts of beginning teachers reflect the salience of student control as a teaching concern. (See also McPherson, 1972, Ch. 4.)

A second norm that governs teacher-student relationships contradicts this picture of the distant teacher because it requires teachers to form personal

bonds with their students in order to motivate them to learn (Burden, 1979; Jackson, 1968; Lampert, in press; Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1982). The tension between these expectations for distance and closeness creates a fundamental ambiguity in the teacher's role. The problem seems most poignant for beginning teachers, but it remains a central issue for experienced teachers as well (Fountain, 1975).

Most research on the norms teachers follow in relating to students has focused on issues of authority and friendship. Increasingly, researchers are trying to find out how teachers interpret this dilemma (Lampert, 1981). Comparatively little attention has been given to the significance teachers attribute to other norms, such as treating students fairly or promoting the learning of all.

Interactions with other teachers. Silver (1973) says that teachers have peers but no colleagues. Her turn of phrase captures the norm of interaction described by many researchers (e. g., Lortie, 1975; McPherson, 1972; Sarason, 1982). Typically, teachers work in isolation, although open-space settings do make their work visible. While they see one another in the lunchroom, in staff meetings, and throughout the building, teachers seldom employ these interactions as opportunities to discuss their work or to collaborate on shared problems.

Teachers interviewed by Lortie describe the ideal colleague as someone willing to help, but never pushy. A norm against asking for help in any area of a serious difficulty prevails because such a request would suggest a failing on the part of the teacher requesting assistance. A complementary norm discourages teachers from telling a peer to do something different. The only permissible exchange of information on teaching techniques is the announcement that an alternative method exists (Newberry, 1977).

While these hands-off norms may be prevalent, they appear to vary from one school building to the next. Little (1982), for example, describes schools where a norm of collegiality prevails. The cultures of these schools support such practices as teachers observing each other's teaching, providing suggestions for improvement, and discussing professional problems.

The hands-off norms need not imply that teachers within a building are not on friendly terms. In many buildings, teachers expect support from their co-workers and may socialize with them out of school (e. g., Biklen, 1983; Silver, 1973). Even so, they avoid talking about instructional practices. Commonly, lunchroom talk deals with politics, gripes, home life, and the personalities and family backgrounds of individual students, rather than curriculum, instructional content, or teaching methods (McPherson, 1972).

The teacher-center movement (Devaney, 1977; Nemser & Applegate, 1983) is evidence that some teachers think they would benefit from more collegial interaction than is currently available in most schools. Perhaps working in a center with teachers from different buildings reduces the fear of revealing areas of weakness. Yet even some teachers who voluntarily attend teacher centers might use them as places to assemble teaching materials instead of as places to discuss instructional issues or seek advice on teaching difficulties (Feiman, 1975).

Interactions with administrators. The role of the school principal has received increasing attention in the last decade (e. g., Wolcott, 1973; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). Studies of the principal have vacilated between raising the principal to the position of central importance in school operations (e. g., Edmonds, 1982) and declaring that the principal has little effect on school practice (e. g., Ross, 1980). How do teachers think they should treat (and be treated by) the principal?

Many teachers see themselves in an ambiguous position vis-a-vis the principal (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975; McPherson, 1972; Sarason, 1982). On the one hand, they want little interference in their daily classroom routine, particularly in making decisions about curriculum and instruction. On the other hand, they wish the principal would act as a buffer between themselves and outside pressures from district administrators, parents, and other community members (e. g., Biklen, 1983). In addition, they want the principal to be a strong force in maintaining student discipline--backing the teachers in their classroom discipline policies and maintaining consistent school-wide policies. In return for these services, the teachers are willing to cooperate with the principal's initiatives.

This informal system of exchange of favors was described before the increase in collective bargaining agreements, which specified teachers' (and principals') rights and responsibilities. Recent studies suggest that while teachers' contracts have produced some change in interactions with administrators (particularly in districts just beginning collective bargaining), the change has had less effect on the daily work life of teachers than predicted. Mitchell and his colleagues (Mitchell & Kerchner, 1983; Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, & Pryor, 1981) found a general trend toward reduction of the principal's power in the school and toward an insistence on conformity with written policies (i. e., those specified in the contract). The emphasis on explicit public policies tends to make teachers feel less dependent on the good graces of the principal and concomitantly less inclined to go along with the principal's ideas for change. Mitchell emphasizes variation among school districts.

While Johnson (1982) also noted substantial variation among districts, she found a general trend toward continuing the informal exchanges between principals and teachers, even when this departed from contract specifications.

Despite explicit policies on rights and duties, teachers continue to depend on the good will of the principal for many services (e. g., equitable assignment of students to classes, buffering of parent requests and complaints). The principal relied on the good will of the teachers to maintain high educational standards. As a result, the teachers abided by the norms that preceded the contract, sometimes asking the union representatives to ignore contract violations.

Interactions with parents. Although parents may seem to be centrally involved in and concerned with schooling, teachers typically have few interactions with them. When students make reasonable progress, contact may not go beyond the twice-yearly conference, a practice that disappears in the upper grades.

Yet teachers and parents are continually reminded of each others' presence. Parents can see effects of school in their children; teachers can tell when parents support classroom work. Such indirect interaction produces tension, as teacher and parent (particularly female teachers and mothers, see Biklen, 1983; Lightfoot, 1978) compete for the child's attention and loyalty.

Teachers see the ideal relationship with parents as one in which the parents support teacher practices, carry out teacher requests, and do not attempt to interfere with teacher plans (Lightfoot, 1978; Lortie, 1975; McPherson, 1972). This exclusion of parents may be explained partly by teachers' desire to keep family affairs from interfering with students' performance in school. Some teachers do not want their expectations for children to be based on family background. Other teachers see some groups of parents (though perhaps not all parents) as threatening, either because their higher social status calls the teacher's authority into question or because the teachers see

parent demands as unreasonable. Lightfoot (1978) states the matter quite strongly: Teachers

> wish to form coalitions only with parents who are obsequious, appreciative, and uncritical, or accepting of their needs for autonomy. Most parents are viewed as a critical force that, if permitted to interfere, would threaten the teachers' already insecure professional status and self-image. (p. 37)

Teachers enforce their decisions about a child's educational program by drawing on professional status and knowledge. Even though legislation requires that parents approve the programs of special education students, teachers are often able to keep parents from directing the decisions (Weatherly & Lipsky, 1977).

Rewards and Careers in Teaching

What rewards to teachers get from teaching? How do they envision their career prospects? Answers to these questions would increase understanding of the satisfactions teachers derive from their work and provide direction for making that work more rewarding.

Occupational rewards are often classified as extrinsic or intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards are the public benefits of high salary, short working hours, elevated status, and significant power. Intrinsic rewards, sometimes called psychic rewards or subjective rewards, are aspects of work that are valued and only visible to insiders. To determine whether working with young people is an occupational reward, one must explore the perspectives of the teachers in question. Researchers have studied such intrinsic rewards as knowing that students are learning, emotional attachment to students, interaction with colleagues, satisfaction in performing a valuable service, enjoyment of teaching activities themselves, and enjoyment of learning from teaching.

Teachers vary in the importance they attach to both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Even the supposedly objective benefits of money and status are not valued equally by all teachers.

Extrinsic Rewards

Teaching is typically portrayed as an occupation largely devoid of extrinsic rewards. While teachers aspire to professional status, they have yet to attain the associated pay, power, and prestige. Indeed, teaching may have lost ground in the past decade. How do teachers reconcile themselves to the apparent absence of extrinsic rewards?

Salary. Teachers have never been well paid; moreover, whatever salary gains were made in an era of teacher shortages and collective bargaining have been eroded. Annual teaching salaries are not competitive with salaries in fields with similar educational requirements. Furthermore, teachers' salaries rise only modestly over the course of their careers.

The psychological importance of teachers' salaries is, however, not well understood and probably differs greatly from teacher to teacher. Hall (1982) describes two teaching couples with similar backgrounds and educational preparation where the total income of one couple is almost double that of the other couple. The high-salaried couple (from an area with a long history of support for public education) seem content with their life-style, while the low-salaried couple feel financially pressed. The psychological significance of a teaching salary may be affected by whether the teachers' spouse is in a high paying job or the teaching salary represents half or all of the family's income. The increase in the number of single-parent families (Sweet & Jacobsen, 1983) may also bear on how different teachers perceive their earnings.

Status. The status of teaching has declined in the past decade, and teachers are sensitive to their tarnished image. Heath (cited in Fiske, 1983) has found that "teachers feel a declining sense of social status" (p. 18), and the Carnegie commission report on high schools describes secondary-school teachers as "deeply troubled . . . about loss of status, the bureaucratic pressures, a negative public image" (cited in Fiske, 1983, p. 18). The percentage of parents who would like their children to enter teaching continues to decline (Gallup, 1983, p. 44). From many teachers' perspectives, the low status of teaching is a significant occupational hazard.

Work schedule. The number of hours teachers are required to be in school is small compared to the time other workers must spend at their job sites. The typical mandatory work day is less than eight hours, and schools are not in session during the summer and other holidays. Though many teachers spend time at home preparing for work, they retain considerable flexibility in their work schedule.

This flexibility can be seen as an occupational reward. Teachers can use it to devote themselves to outside interests (other jobs, raising a family, volunteer work) without the feeling of shirking work responsibilities. Many studies report that teachers find the flexible schedule attractive (Biklen, 1983; Hall, 1982; Lortie, 1975; Nelson, in press).

Power. While power may be a significant extrinsic reward in many occupations, it is seldom mentioned as a teaching reward. As Lortie (1975) comments, "teachers are not supposed to *enjoy* exercising power per se" (p. 102).

Intrinsic Rewards

Given the relative absence of extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards gain importance. As Lipsky (1980) points out, in a job (like teaching) where

outcomes are relatively difficult to measure, the individual's own definition of what makes work worthwhile is crucially important because it influences what is actually done more than the formal goals and organizational policies. Some recent research (Hall, 1982) suggests that the intrinsic rewards of teaching are on the wane.

Students. Most teachers find student learning and student attachment rewarding. While teachers feel pressure to increase the achievement of their entire class, they find greater rewards in the success of individual students (Lortie, 1975; Jackson, 1968; Wise, 1979). This represents a disjuncture between institutional goals and teachers' goals. Many elementary-school teachers also enjoy the affection of their students. For secondary-school teachers, open displays of affection are less acceptable, especially from students of the opposite sex (Hall, 1982).

Teachers in several studies have reported that rewards from students have declined (Leonard, 1983; Newman, 1978; Silver, 1973). Hall (1982), for example, found secondary-school teachers frustrated by the increasing difficulty in getting students to learn and worried about the increasing danger of physical abuse by students.

Colleagial stimulation and support. The isolation of most teachers has been frequently noted (e. g., Cohen, 1973; Lortie, 1975; McPherson, 1972; Silver, 1973; Waller, 1932). Such isolation prevents teachers from enjoying the rewards of collegial interaction--support and praise for work well done, stimulation of new ideas.

While it appears that psychic rewards in teaching come from children, not adults, some research (e. g., Cohen, 1973; Sieber, 1981) suggests that this is not universally true. There are schools with substantial collegial

interaction where teachers enjoy talking shop, observing and critiquing each others' teaching, and working together to improve instruction (Little, 1982). Similarly, Cohen (1973) found that many teachers in open-space schools, where the classroom door could never be closed, were more satisfied with their jobs than teachers in schools with traditional architecture.

The emphasis on intrinsic rewards from students, rather than adults, may also be less applicable at the secondary-school level (Mann, 1976) or in schools where student achievement is low (Silver, 1973). When rewarding interactions with students are scarce, interactions with other teachers can become a primary source of intrinsic rewards.

The glow of service. The belief that they are providing a public service may be rewarding for many teachers. Like other government service employees, teachers tend to see themselves as performing an essential service that no one else is willing to perform (Lipsky, 1980). The service image is, however, more difficult to maintain since collective bargaining has made the public more aware of teachers' interest in their own well-being. Those entering the job market have not abandoned the ideal of public service, but teaching is less clearly an attractive service occupation (see Sykes, 1983, pp. 111-112).

Enjoyment of teaching activities. Teaching activities themselves can also be a source of intrinsic rewards. Mitchell and his colleagues (Mitchell, Ortiz, & Mitchell, 1982) found that teachers do not select learning activities because they lead to valued outcomes, but because they value such activities in and of themselves. Teachers vary in the kinds of classroom activities they value. Some teachers prefer activities designed to foster achievement; others prefer activities designed to be nurturant. Some teachers get rewards from conducting carefully planned lessons; others get satisfaction from

creating a classroom environment where students have many opportunities to follow their own interests.

Plihal (1982) found that teachers who get substantial rewards from seeing the effects of their instruction get relatively little reward from the mere process of interaction, and vice versa. These preferences were related to the organization of instruction. Teachers found student learning most rewarding in math lessons, where learning goals were well defined and students worked alone at their seats. In social studies lessons, where learning goals are broad and group activities dominate, teachers found the process most rewarding.

Concepts of Career

Continuity. As indicated in the preceding section on research methods, recent studies of teachers' perceptions of their careers reveal that many female teachers do not view career continuity as an important characteristic of their work. Though interruption in employment call for explanation in a business or law career, some teachers see an in-and-out employment pattern as acceptable or even as evidence of a praiseworthy commitment to child rearing. The pattern is becoming less common, however, as women are more likely to take only a short pregnancy leave (Sweet & Jacobsen, 1983).

Vertical advancement. With few exceptions, teachers cannot be promoted and still remain teachers. Teachers may change to other school positions (e. g., principal), but even that "promotion" is open to very few. In this respect teaching seems to be a job with little to offer the ambitious careerist. What the teacher may envision as a long-term career is a few years establishing competence and securing tenure followed by 40-odd years of performing the same job with new sets of students. In the past, teachers may

have looked forward to a move from an inner-city, low-socioeconomic status (SES) school to a higher-SES school, either in a different part of the city or in an affluent suburb (Becker, 1952). The shortage of teaching jobs has reduced such horizontal mobility. Cohen (1973) reports that the lack of vertical mobility is frustrating for some ambitious female elementary-school teachers; other ambitious teachers wish to avoid leaving the classroom, so their desire for recognition and reward is not blocked by absence of a career ladder (though it may be blocked by absence of opportunities for public reward and recognition).

The specialization of teaching. Two decades ago, few distinctions could be made among teaching positions. Teachers were certified either as multi-subject elementary-school teachers or as single-subject secondary-school teachers. The lack of differentiation among teaching roles has frequently been cited as limiting teachers' opportunities to take on different school responsibilities.

The rise in employment of teachers' aides and specialist teachers has broken that pattern of homogeneity. Partially as a result of the availability of federal compensatory-education programs, many schools hired aides to assist the regular classroom teachers. The altered staffing patterns have tended to persist even when federal funds were removed (Kirst, 1983). Though still in a minority, specialist teachers make up an increasingly larger fraction of American teachers (Kerr, 1983). Many teachers begin their careers as specialists, but the existence of such specialist positions gives experienced classroom teachers a visible example of other possibilities for teaching employment.

The effect of this increase in the variety of teaching roles on teachers' views of their careers is largely unexplored. Kerr (1983) suggests that

teachers see specialization as a way to gain autonomy, pay, and status; Milofsky (1976) describes a case in which a specialist felt ostracized by the regular teachers in her building. The effects of specialization on the cultures of teaching deserve study.

Commitment. Commitment is one indication of the importance teachers attach to their work. Although sociological studies of work have typically concluded that teachers lack career commitment, recent research on what teaching means to teachers sheds new light on this issue. The difference in conclusions stems from the use of different definitions of "commitment" and "career." Because the research for more appropriate definitions is motivated largely by a desire to correct the male bias in previous analyses, we discuss this issue under the feminization of teaching in the section on the genesis of teaching cultures.

Teaching: What's in It for the Teacher?

Teaching, like other occupations, tends to attract and hold people who are initially disposed to value what the work has to offer and to be able to cope with difficulties the work presents. Thus it comes as no surprise that teaching, with a reputation as low-paid service work with children, is viewed by many teachers as rewarding in terms of interactions with students and the pleasure of serving, not because of the pay or opportunities for advancement.

This functional match between job characteristics and expectations about work is likely to continue as long as the nature of the work matches what people expected when they began and as long as those outside the occupation are satisfied with those within.

Because both of these situations have recently changed, questions are being raised about the desirability of restructuring the occupation.

Discussions about reforms should attend to the features of teaching that teachers have found rewarding and to how these have changed in the past decade (e. g., reductions in rewards from interacting with students). Advocates of change should, however, take care to note that if they succeed in attracting a new group of entrants into the occupation, those newcomers may expect a different mix of occupational rewards from that expected by teachers on whom most research has been conducted. If the new group is to remain in teaching or if similar individuals are to continue to enter teaching, changes in teaching must reflect their expectations.

The status and attractiveness of teaching might be enhanced if teachers were seen to possess a special body of knowledge. The belief that anyone can teach makes it harder to take pride in the expertise gained through professional education and teaching experience and may be a source of tensions between teachers, principals, and parents. As Lightfoot (1978) points out, teachers' own uncertainty about their judgment and status makes them vulnerable to parent complaints or demands for change. Uncertainty about whether they have special knowledge lowers teachers' status and makes them question their occupational choice.

Teachers' Knowledge

Teachers have not been seen as possessing a unique body of professional knowledge and expertise. The prevailing view among most researchers is that teachers have experience while academicians have knowledge. Concerned about this portrait, some researchers have sought other ways to describe and analyze what teachers know. Instead of searching for professional knowledge or technical knowledge, they have looked more broadly at teachers' practical knowledge--that is, those beliefs, insights, and habits that enable teachers to do their work in schools. In so doing, they show that teachers' knowledge

has the characteristics that philosophers have always attributed to practical knowledge--that it is time-bound and situation-specific, personally compelling and oriented toward action. They have not yet dealt with the question of why and on what grounds these beliefs, insights, and habits should be considered knowledge.

In this section, we analyze a few empirical studies of teachers' practical knowledge. The basic research strategy for gathering data on what teachers know is to get them to talk about their work in interviews (e. g., Elbaz, 1983), teacher seminars (e. g., Lampert, 1981; Lampert, in press) or discussions of observations and classroom videotapes (e. g., Erickson, *Handbook* chapter, in preparation). On the basis of these verbal data, researchers make inferences and claims about the content, uses, and organization of teachers' knowledge. Before illustrating this research, we consider some of the less flattering views of teachers' knowledge.

A Dim View of Teachers' Knowledge

Researchers have portrayed teachers' knowledge as a mixture of idiosyncratic experience and personal synthesis. For example, Lortie (1975) argues that teachers lack a technical culture, a set of commonly held, empirically derived practices and principles of pedagogy. As a result, teachers must individually develop practices consistent with their personality and experience. Jackson (1968) also implies that teachers lack professional knowledge. Teachers, he argues, are content with simple explanations. They justify their teaching on the basis of feelings and impulse rather than reflection and thought. They take strong stands against practices different from their own and rely on personal experience to defend what they do. The meanings they give to abstract terms are limited to the boundaries of their own experience.

Two explanations have been offered to account for this picture of knowledge generation and use in teaching. Lortie (1975) links the inadequacies of teacher education to the absence of a technical culture in teaching. If there is no knowledge base, then teacher education cannot transmit relevant professional knowledge. Sarason (1982) ties the fact that teachers lack a shared body of practical knowledge to teacher isolation. Because most teachers work apart from their colleagues, they have little opportunity to articulate and compare what they know. Furthermore, the need to respond continually to classroom demands is thought to foster a reliance on intuition and impulse rather than reason (Huberman, 1983).

These explanations stem from a restricted view of knowledge in teaching. Lortie reduces problems of practice to technical choices. By limiting his notion of useful knowledge to tested relationships between ends and means, he implies that goals in teaching are givens, not things to be chosen or justified. In trying to explain teachers' reliance on intuition and impulse, Jackson implies that teaching cannot be reasonable. This seems untenable. On-the-spot decisions cannot be considered capricious just because they require instantaneous response in a complex and fluid environment.

The tendency to question teachers' knowledge also stems from placing a higher value on scientific knowledge than on practical and personal knowledge. Presumably, scientific knowledge offers a more objective and reliable picture of classroom life because it transcends the details of specific classrooms, the biases of individual teachers and the necessary limits of their experience. Caught up in the demands of their own work, teachers cannot solve problems in general; they must deal with specific situations. Thus their descriptions of teaching sound more like stories than theories because they are full of the particulars of their own experience. General solutions are considered

better because they are not tied to a specific time and place (Lampert, 1981; Schwab, 1959).

Because practical problems are defined by these ties, this argument criticizes practical knowledge on inappropriate grounds. The close connection to practical situations where teachers' knowledge is shaped and used does not necessarily make it less valuable, just different from scientific knowledge. As Buchmann (1983a) argues, the purpose of practical knowledge is to inform wise action not to advance general understanding. The goal of wise action and the practical contexts of teaching provide the appropriate terms for describing what teachers know, how they acquire this knowledge, and how they put it to use.

Below we discuss some empirical research on teachers' knowledge under the headings of content, uses, and organization. Looking at content implies that teachers have a substantive body of knowledge; it is, however, only by considering how this knowledge is used that one can understand the sense in which it is practical. Understanding the organization of teachers' knowledge refines one's appreciation of its uses by showing how different forms of knowledge permit different kinds of performances.

What Teachers Know

Teachers draw on diverse kinds of knowledge in carrying out their work. Still, few researchers have studied the content of teachers' knowledge. This may reflect a narrow view of teachers' knowledge or uncertainty about what kinds of knowledge to look for. By suggesting five categories of practical knowledge in teaching--knowledge of self, the milieu of teaching, subject matter, curriculum development, and instruction--Elbaz (1983) offers one way of organizing the content of teachers' knowledge. These categories, drawn from a case study of practical knowledge based on interviews with a high

school English teacher named Sarah, point to areas of content knowledge that seem relevant to teaching and may provide a useful guide for research on what teachers know.

Whereas Elbaz describes the scope of one teacher's practical knowledge, Lampert (1981; in press) focuses on a single category, personal knowledge, which combines Elbaz's "knowledge of self" with knowledge of students. According to Lampert, personal knowledge includes knowledge of "who the teacher is and what she cares about" (p. 204) as well as knowledge of students beyond that provided by pencil-and-paper tests. If teacher and students work together over time in a common endeavor, teachers come to know their students as people and to hold out some expectations for their human development. The teacher's vision of what a child should become is based on what that individual teacher cares about as well as what s/he knows about the child. This personal knowledge is essential in accomplishing what teachers care about, what students want, and what the curriculum requires.

How Teachers Use Practical Knowledge

A unifying theme in this small body of work on teachers' knowledge is the recognition that teachers' knowledge is "actively related to the world of practice" (Elbaz, 1983). Researchers have described and conceptualized how practical knowledge is used to manage dilemmas in teaching (Lampert, 1981) or to observe and make sense of what goes on in classrooms (Erickson, handbook chapter in preparation).

Elbaz explores different ways teachers use the practical knowledge they formulate in response to the situations they encounter. Teachers use practical knowledge to express purposes, give shape and meaning to their experiences, and structure social realities. All these uses are conditioned by the way teachers conceive of theory, practice, and their relationship.

Separating the different uses of practical knowledge is helpful for purposes of analysis, but in practice, teachers' knowledge functions as an organized whole, orienting the teacher to his/her situation and allowing him/her to act. Elbaz illustrates this in her discussion of Sarah's decision to stop teaching English and to work in the Reading Center. As Sarah became more uncomfortable with the back-to-basics stance of the English department and with what she called the "phony power structure" of the classroom, she found the Reading Center to have a more congenial social framework. There she could function as a person with skills to share rather than as an authority figure. Sarah used her practical knowledge to structure a new social reality that expressed her goals as a teacher and helped resolve the tensions she felt from the demands of the department, her own views of literature, and the students' indifference to English.

Lampert (1981; in press) also shows how teachers use their knowledge to resolve tensions, in this case tensions between the interpersonal and institutional aspects of teaching. Although Lampert's findings about the personal nature of teachers' knowledge accord with Lortie's and Jackson's claims, her interpretation moves in a different direction. Rather than inferring some deficiency in teachers, she argues that teachers use their personal knowledge to manage practical dilemmas. Over and over again, the teachers in her study illustrate how they managed to teach without having to make the dichotomous choices social scientists associate with the teachers's role (e. g., to satisfy either personal goals or institutional requirements; to foster either human development or academic excellence).

According to Lampert, teachers use their personal knowledge of children, what they know about a particular child, and what seems like the appropriate teacher role, to accommodate to the classroom requirements of time and

curriculum as well as to a child's own knowledge, interests, and feelings. Through specific examples of encounters between teachers and students, Lampert illustrates "a complicated personal and practical process of accommodations" (p. 149) in which teachers express their responsibilities to both students and society.

Like Elbaz, Erickson (in press) shows how early elementary teachers use practical knowledge to make sense out of what happens in their classroom. Through observations, informal interviewing, and discussion of classroom videotapes, Erickson found that teachers used their knowledge of students and the year-long curriculum to simplify their view of the classroom and to interpret specific things children did. The two teachers Erickson studied looked at their students in a multidimensional way and viewed their academic work in the context of an annual curriculum cycle, attending to different aspects of an activity at different points in the year. This attention to different features of a situation over time resembles the strategy of dilemma management that Lampert describes.

By showing how teachers use their personal and practical knowledge to resolve tensions, manage dilemmas, and simplify the complexities of their work, researchers underscore the critical role of teachers' knowledge in teaching.

How Teachers' Knowledge Is Organized

Different forms of practical knowledge enable people to engage in different kinds of performances. For example, mastery of specific ways of acting in particular situations makes one less capable of responding to variable situations. Knowing the connections between different actions and their consequences provides tested ways of meeting similar situations in the future but will not help in anticipating a changing future (Schwab, 1959). In describing

the structure of teachers' practical knowledge, researchers have begun to explore how practical knowledge is ordered and what uses its different structuring elements make possible.

To describe the organization of Sarah's knowledge, Elbaz (1983) distinguished three levels that reflect varying degrees of generality: rules of practice, practical principles, and images. A rule of practice is a brief, clearly formulated statement of what to do in a particular situation. In using a rule of practice, the ends or purposes of action are taken for granted. For example, Sarah has a rule for dealing with a learning disabled student: "He has my full attention *after* I finish all the instructions" (p. 133).

A practical principle is a broader, more inclusive statement that embodies a rationale. The use of practical principles involves reflection. When Sarah talks of trying to make the children happy to walk into her classroom, she states a principle regarding remedial work with students. This principle governs a variety of practices ranging from unstructured talk to coaching a student for an upcoming exam. It reflects her beliefs about the relationship between students' emotional states and their subsequent learning.

Images capture the teacher's knowledge and purposes at the most general level, orienting her overall conduct rather than directing specific actions. "The teacher's feelings, values, needs and beliefs combine as she forms images of how teaching should be, and marshals experience, theoretical knowledge, school folklore to give substance to these images" (Elbaz, 1983, p. 134). The image of a window captures the orienting purposes of Sarah's work: She wanted "to have a window onto the kids and what they are thinking" (p. 121) and, in turn, she wanted her own window to be more open.

The concept of images could be useful in studying teachers' practical knowledge. Images mediate between thought and action at a more general level than rules and principles and show how different kinds of knowledge and values come together in teaching. Images express the teachers' purposes. Because they are open, taking on different senses in different situations, images guide teachers intuitively, inspiring rather than determining their actions. Rules and principles embody instructional knowledge but images order all aspects of practical knowledge. Images also extend knowledge by generating new rules and principles and by helping teachers to choose among them when they conflict.

Another structuring of teachers' knowledge that mediates between thought and action comes from Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel's (1976) interview study of 60 teachers trying to implement more open and informal approaches in the classroom. While the researchers acknowledge that commitment to an open education philosophy is critical in implementing such an approach, they do not describe how such a commitment and the requisite knowledge, which is the focus of their study, interact. This was not their intent. Still, one can imagine how the concept of image might serve to capture the way different kinds of knowledge combine with experience, values, and beliefs as a teacher creates and runs an open classroom. Differences in the imagery that open-classroom teachers hold may explain some of the variation the researchers found in teachers' beliefs about children and curriculum.

The researchers conceptualized teachers' beliefs about curriculum and students in terms of classroom activities (surface content), the teacher's learning priorities for children (organizing content), and the connections betweeen the two. A picture of the surface curriculum was reconstructed from teachers' responses to questions about a typical day, the kind of planning

they did outside of school, the physical set up of the classroom, and the materials and equipment in the room. Recurring themes suggested organizing priorities. Connections were inferred when teachers' talk moved back and forth between classroom activities and organizing priorities, with specific encounters illustrating broader concerns and broader priorities related to specific instances.

The researchers found that teachers differed in the number and strength of the connections they saw between their priorities and what was going on in their classroom. For example, teachers with more and clearer priorities tended to value materials that could serve a variety of learning purposes. The researchers relate this to the knowledge a teacher uses to recognize and realize a learning priority (knowledge of materials, subject matter, children, and the learning process).

Judging the Worth of Teachers' Knowledge

These studies of teachers' knowledge project an image of the teacher as someone who holds and uses knowledge to shape the work situation and guide practice. By opening up teachers' knowledge to inquiry, researchers are making a statement that the content of teachers' minds is worth investigating on its own terms. Studies of teachers' practical knowledge can greatly advance the understanding of teaching as long as researchers are sensitive to underlying epistemological issues and to questions about the sociology of teachers' knowledge.

Because of teachers' position in the school hierarchy, their personal knowledge often carries less authority than more objective data. The teachers in Lampert's study, for example, felt that the school's preoccupation with standardized, impersonal measures made their deepest concerns seem solipsistic and their personal knowledge unreal (p. 213).

Different forms of knowledge may be more helpful at different levels in the school system. What administrators want to know about student achievement is different from what teachers want to know (Amarel & Chittenden, 1982). Still, norms and practices that devalue teachers' knowledge contribute to the deskilling of teachers and undermine the quality of their work (Apple, 1982; see also the section of this paper on the feminization of teaching, p. 46-48).

Such norms and practices also ignore the critical role that personal knowledge plays in teaching. As Lampert (1981) puts it, the answer to why Johnny can't read will not be found in a book. Johnny's teacher[3] must pull together her knowledge of learning to read with what she knows about Johnny from her personal relationship with him and decide what she wants to have happen, monitoring his progress and adapting her goals and practice.

It does not follow, however, that everything a teacher believes or is willing to act on merits the label "knowledge," although that view has some support. Such a position makes the concept of knowledge as justified belief meaningless. How then can one evaluate teachers' knowledge? Buchmann (1983b, in press) addresses this question in her analytic work on knowledge use and justification in teaching. Teachers must inevitably act on incomplete and uncertain evidence while maintaining their faith in the appropriateness of what they do. Precisely because of these conditions, it is critical that teachers' beliefs be justified on the basis of public criteria (e. g., colleagues, the curriculum, equity) rather than private ones (e. g., personal preferences) and held open to new evidence and subsequent revision.

Buchmann's points are well taken. Applied to research on teachers' knowledge, they raise important questions about how such knowledge develops

---

[3]All the teachers Lampert studied were women.

and on what grounds it changes. Still, her analysis might be more appropriate for knowledge that comes in the form of propositions, leaving researchers with the challenge of formulating criteria that can be used to evaluate teachers' images.

Despite the diversity of teaching cultures, researchers who have looked at norms for interaction, occupational rewards, and teachers' knowledge have found shared ways of thinking that set groups of teachers apart from the general population. While Waller's (1932) claim that one could easily pick out the teachers in a crowd is an overstatement, experienced teachers do see their world differently from other people. We address the questions of why teaching cultures have taken their current forms and how individuals acquire a teaching culture in the remainder of this paper.

The Genesis of Teaching Cultures

Part of understanding the cultures of teaching involves understanding their genesis. How does it happen that teachers share certain sentiments or views of their work? What accounts for prevailing patterns of knowledge use in teaching? How do the norms that govern teachers' interactions with parents, students, and administrators evolve? How did teaching come to have low status? Why is it that common instructional practices prevail? These are questions about the origins of teaching cultures. In the previous section we were concerned with research that paints a picture of the cultures of teaching by describing shared sentiments, habits of mind, and patterns of interaction. In this section we focus on research that seeks to account for the genesis of these aspects of teaching cultures.

Some researchers have tried to explain all or part of the cultures of teaching in terms of individual characteristics. From this perspective, the fact that teachers share common outlooks simply shows that people with similar backgrounds and personalities go into teaching. While this kind of

explanation may account for some of the shared meanings teachers attach to their work, it ignores the influences that stem from the contexts of teaching itself.

The most immediate context of teaching is the classroom. Since Jackson's (1968) classic study of life in classrooms, researchers have focused on how common features of the classroom environment shape common patterns of belief and behavior in teachers. Teachers not only work in classrooms, they also work in institutions that surround them with constraints and opportunities. These organizational properties represent a second source of influence on the cultures of teaching. Finally, schools function in a larger social context that shapes and, in turn, is shaped by what goes on there. Thus the cultures of teaching also reflect the influence of economic, social, and political factors.

In this section, we draw on studies that account for aspects of teaching cultures in terms of classroom, organizational, and societal influences. For example, aspects of practical knowledge and teacher-student relations have been related to the properties of classrooms, norms of interaction, and rewards in teaching have been connected to school structure, and teacher status and self image have been linked with the role of women in society. While these examples do not cover all the external influences that researchers have studied, they do illustrate a common thesis--that the cultures of teaching are shaped by the contexts of teaching.

The Classroom Context

Classrooms have distinctive environmental properties that shape teachers' actions. Researchers have called attention to the complexity and immediacy of classroom events, and to the fact that they occur in groups. They have

linked these features to teachers' sentiments, habits of mind, and patterns of behavior.

Classroom press. Classrooms are complicated and busy settings, serving a variety of purposes and containing a variety of processes and events. Teachers must manage groups, deal with individual needs and responses, maintain records, evaluate student abilities, promote learning, and establish routines. Jackson (1968) found that elementary teachers engage in 200-300 exchanges every hour of their working day. Not only do teachers have a variety of things to do, they must often attend to more than one thing at a time. As they help individual students, teachers must monitor the rest of the class. As they conduct lessons, they must anticipate interruptions, distribute opportunities to speak, and keep an eye on the time. Smith and Geoffrey's (1968) characterization of the teacher as a ringmaster seems apt.

The immediacy and complexity of classroom life have been linked with the preference of many teachers for simple explanations and practical solutions and with teachers' resistance to proposals for change. The sheer number and pace of events call for quick and decisive actions. The work day offers little time to unravel the complex causes of the reality teachers face. Researchers like Jackson (1968) have questioned whether a deeper level of understanding would help teachers cope with the here and now. Others like Erickson have sought to uncover the tacit knowledge gained through on-the-job experience, knowledge that enables teachers to accommodate the demands of classroom life. (See section on teachers' practical knowledge.)

Teachers' alleged conservatism has also been linked to the pressing demands of the present. Doyle and Ponder (1977) found that teachers were most receptive to proposals for change that fit with current classroom procedures

and did not cause major disruptions. Those who criticize teachers for maintaining this practicality ethic may underestimate the added complications that flow from attempts to alter established practice and the degree to which current practices are highly adaptive to classroom realities. For example, most teachers probably find it easier to instruct the whole class than to set up and monitor multiple and simultaneous learning centers. As historians of instructional practices argue, certain formats, like recitation, persist because they fit the environmental demands of classrooms (Hoekter & Ahlbrand, 1969; Cuban, 1984).

Teaching to a group. The group-based nature of classrooms accounts for some of the fundamental ambiguities in the student-teacher relationship. (See section on norms for interaction.) Unlike tutors who work with one student, teachers work with groups of 25-30 students. They must therefore deal with a host of individual and group needs. Since many students do not come to school voluntarily, teachers cannot count on their willingness to do assigned tasks. Thus the teacher has the dual responsibility of maintaining attention and control over the group while generating an openness to learning. These two tasks often seem incompatible. The former requires a certain distance, while the latter often depends on personal interest and involvement. The group context also means that actions directed toward one student are visible to others and may set a precedent. Thus in dealing with individuals, teachers must always be conscious of the message to the rest of the class (Dreeben, 1973; Waller, 1932).

The ecological argument links aspects of teaching cultures with certain properties of classroom environments. For example, the fact that classrooms contain groups of students means that teachers have both managerial and instructional responsibilities, yet their range of options for carrying out

these responsibilities is limited by these same classroom properties. From this perspective, part of the cultures of teaching can be seen as the outcome of a process of adaptation to the environmental demands of classrooms. As we will discuss later in our section on how teaching cultures are acquired, this process of adaptation is particularly noticeable in the novice who must learn the ecology of the classroom in order to succeed as a teacher (Doyle, 1977a, 1977b; Zeichner, 1983).

Organizational Determinants of the Cultures of Teaching

While the facts of classroom life probably impinge most directly on teachers, the structure of schools also shapes what teachers do and how they think about their work. Researchers have accounted for aspects of the cultures of teaching by analyzing the influence of schools as institutions. For example, the cellular structure of schools has been linked with a norm of non-interference among teachers. The authority structure has been associated with teachers' sentiments about what constitutes outside help and what feels like interference. Moreover, in discussing the sources of frustration in their work, teachers point to tensions between the job and the work of teaching. One manifestation of this tension is the incompatibility between institutional goals and teachers' goals, a common theme in teachers' writing and in research on what teaching does to teachers.

Cellular structure. Although teachers may work in isolation in open space schools or work together despite physical barriers, the egg-crate architecture of many schools and the school schedule encourage teacher isolation. Teachers are cut off from their colleagues because they spend most of the day in their own classrooms. Typically teachers have (or m

Little, 1982 for exceptions.) While external conditions alone do not account for teacher isolation and uncertainty, they make it harder for teachers to know how well they are doing or to see what others are doing. Sarason (1982) captures the psychological effects of the geographical properties of most schools: "The teacher is alone with problems and dilemmas, constantly thrown back on personal resources, having little or no interpersonal vehicles available for purposes of stimulation, change or control" (p. 162).

Some researchers link the cellular organization of schools with the norms of individualism and noninterference among teachers. The modal-spatial arrangement encourages privacy, hence a prevailing norm of noninterference. In most schools, the classroom is considered inviolate. Teachers are not supposed to invade one another's classrooms or advise on methods or content unless directly asked. The physical isolation conveys the message that teachers ought to cope with their problems on their own, reinforcing the norm of individualism. Working it out alone has come to be accepted as the way it should be in teaching.

These effects of the cellular structure may be seen either as an unfortunate lack of mutual support or as a welcome guarantee of professional autonomy. The uncertainties of teaching are exacerbated by the fact that teachers cannot easily turn to one another for help and support. This reality is especially salient for the novice who must sink or swim alone (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Grant, 1981). The flip side of teacher isolation, however, is a certain amount of freedom. Teachers value the opportunity to run their classrooms as they see fit. A fifth-grade teacher interviewed by Jackson (1968) put it bluntly: "If they made teaching too rigid or started telling me that I must use this book or that book and could not bring in supplementary materials of my own, then I'd quit" (p. 129). Still, without clear criteria for

evaluating teaching and consensus about the goals of instruction, this freedom carries a heavy responsibility. While it may evoke great effort in some teachers, others can get by doing very litte (Cusick, 1983).

The principal's authority. The issue of teacher autonomy is often linked with the structure of authority relations in schools. The school assigns formal authority to the principal. Through the allocation of prized resources--materials, time, space--as well as through sanctions, the principal can exert considerable influence over teachers' working environment. As the chief administrative officer, the principal is expected to provide leadership, advice, supervision, and evaluation. The principal, however is seldom seen as a respected expert on classroom practice (Biklen, 1983; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). Some teachers resent the fact that the person responsible for judging their competence observes them infrequently and knows less than they do about what is going on in their room. The fact that principals have more status and authority while teachers know more about teaching leads to feelings of ambivalence on the part of teachers toward their principal. (See section on norms of interaction.) When the principal places higher value on the impersonal, bureaucratic, and standardized aspects of schooling, teachers feel a conflict between the job and the work of teaching.

Conflicts between the job and work of teaching. The work of teaching includes all those aspects directly related to the realization of educational goals: motivating students, getting to know them as individuals, assessing their understanding. The job of teaching is concerned with the realization of organizational or bureaucratic goals: maintaining order in classrooms and corridors, keeping students busy, categorizing students so that they can be processed by the administrative machinery. The tension between the

organizational and personal aspects of teaching is a pervasive theme in the analytic and empirical literature on teaching (e. g., Berlak & Berlak, 1981; Dreeben, 1973; Jackson, 1968). It also comes through when researchers describe teachers' views of their work (e. g., Biklen, 1983; Hall, 1982; Lampert, 1981; McPherson, 1982) and when teachers speak for themselves (Freedman, Jackson, & Boles, 1983).

The accumulation of administrative activities makes teaching difficult. The teacher must hold students' attention to get subject matter across, but the child coming for the attendance records, the intercom announcement of a football pep-rally, and the surprise visit from a parent all break the spell (Lortie, 1975). For some teachers, these bothersome administrative tasks and interruptions reflect the low esteem that others have for them (Biklen, 1983). Wise (1979) documents the tremendous increase over the past decade in administrative directives related to legal, judicial, and administrative policies that constrain teachers and take time away from teaching.

Often the tension between the job and the work of teaching is cast in terms of conflicting goals and standards. Many teachers want student learning to be based on individual needs, yet their schools expect them to improve standardized test scores, cover prescribed curricula at a set pace, and maintain an orderly classroom. Administrators and parents pay more attention to report cards and test scores than to whether students understand what they are being taught. In most schools, teachers are judged by how well their students do on standardized tests and how quietly they move through the halls, not by how well teachers know them. Teachers are supposed to provide equal educational opportunities, but school structures emphasize comparative worth and increase competition among students, teachers, and parents.

The literature on teacher socialization and teacher burnout describes the effects of this underlying tension on the cultures of teaching. (See section on the acquisition of teaching cultures.) As the job of teaching intrudes on the work of teachers, many teachers redefine their goals in managerial terms (Lipsky, 1980). The difficulties of defining and measuring teaching success combine with institutional requirements to encourage the substitution of such managerial goals as covering materials and keeping students busy and quiet for educational goals. While the phrase "teacher burnout" connotes the depletion of the individual's inner resources, Freedman et al. (1983) argue that "burnout" more accurately refers to the anger and frustration teachers feel at having to cope with conflicting institutional demands and societal expectations.

Lampert (1981) found that teachers use their personal knowledge to manage the dichotomies in their work environment. (See section on teachers' knowledge.) On the other hand, Gitlin (1983) shows how the use of individualized curricula with predetermined, sequential objectives keeps teachers from using their personal knowledge to influence the direction of student learning. In an ethnographic study of two teams of teachers working with such a curriculum, Gitlin found that objectives, set problems, and posttests shaped teachers' relations with students.

Teachers' integrity is threatened when school organizations ignore what they think is essential to their teaching--their personal caring about and knowledge of students. As one teacher put it, teaching and learning seem incongruent in an organization that lets people who "have never met the children" make "big decisions about how they will be educated" (Lampert, 1981, p. 221).

Some teachers in Lampert's study saw the tensions between the personal standards internal to the classroom and the external measures of students' and teachers' accomplishments as a distinction between feminine and masculine perspectives on work. These teachers struggled

> to bring together the indiv dualistic and wholistic (sic) caring for human persons, which is usually associated with women's roles in the family, with their feelings about, and responsibilities for, accomplishments in their jobs, which are measured by the impersonal, task-specific, generalized standards of the workplace. (p. 240)

This struggle is part of a larger struggle that women face in a society that devalues their work. As school priorities reflect the values of the dominant society, so the cultures of teaching are shaped by the social forces that surround them. Because the quality of teaching is intimately related to a view of teaching as "women's work," and directly affected by recent changes in opportunities for women, we chose this focus to illustrate how social forces influence the cultures of teaching and the ways social scientists have studied teachers.

Teaching as Women's Work

Most teachers are women. They represent 83% of the elementary teachers, 49% of the secondary teachers and 68% of all teachers (Feistritzer, 1983). Beyond this numerical domination is the prevailing view of teaching as womens' work. This association has affected the status of teaching and the self image of teachers. It also may explain why few scholars, until recently, have shown much interest in studying the perspectives of women who teach.

Some historians and sociologists have begun to rectify the situation by putting women teachers at the center of their inquiries. Two related lines of work can be discerned.

First, historical and contemporary portraits of teaching from the inside have been gathered in order to show how gender affects the social construction of work experience (Biklen, 1983; Hall, 1982; Lightfoot, 1983; Nelson, 1981). For example, the recognition that most teachers are women leads to studies about the intersection of work and career, home and school, because it is women who carry that double burden in American society. This research challenges traditional social-science views of teachers and offers new insights about the cultures of teaching.

A second line of work traces the origins of teacher stereotypes, linking the social devaluation of teaching to its feminization in the nineteenth century (Hoffman, 1981; Lightfoot, 1983; Richardson & Hatcher, 1983; Sugg, 1978). Beyond the social and economic factors, the low status of teaching reflects the cultural perception of teacher as woman. Giv n the influence of the womens' movement, this imagery makes it harder for those who teach to identify proudly with their occupation and discourages the more talented from considering it.

In this section, we summarize the arguments that link cultural images of teaching to the economic conditions and social roles of women in the 19th century. We show how research on elementary school teaching reflects normative expectations and cultural stereotypes of women. Finally, we illustrate how new perspectives on the lives of women teachers point to new conceptualizations of the cultures of teaching.

The special but shadowed status of teachers. The transformation of teaching from a temporary job for men to a profession for women was accompanied by a transformation in popular thinking. With the help of leaders of the common school movement, the image of the teacher shifted from "a second rate man to an exemplary women" (Hoffman, 1981). From the 1840s through the

Civil War, annual reports of school superintendents extolled the special qualification of women for teaching. Horace Mann, in his Fourth Annual Report, argued that women were far more fit than men to be "guides and exemplars of young children" because of their "gentle manner and superior nature," their indifference to honors and future status, and their desire to remain close to home rather than move out into the world. Among the early image makers was Catherine Beecher, an advocate of teaching as "women's true profession," who saw the school as an extension of the domestic sphere (Skylar, 1973).

These arguments were constructed in response to major social changes. Rapid urbanization and industrialization were creating new economic opportunities for men and immigration was increasing the number of school-age children in cities. As women were needed to care for children in schools, their presumed frailties were converted into strengths (Lightfoot, 1983). Still, the economic argument was probably the most compelling one to taxpayers and male school-board members (Elsbree, 1939; Tyack, 1974). Women could be employed for one half to one third the cost of men.

Kaestle (1983) also links the feminization of teaching with the reorganization of schools. Hiring women allowed reformers to press for school innovations such as supervision and grading because gender differences fit with their view that female assistants should serve under male principal teachers, thus forming "an enduring gender-oriented hierarchy in elementary schooling" (p. 220).

The feminization of teaching had important effects on the lives of the women who taught. By the turn of the century, teaching had changed the opportunities of many young women from different social classes whose only other options included domestic service, marriage, or factory work. Still, teaching

did not (and does not) have the status of or command the same respect as "men's work."

The influence of female stereotypes. The feminization of teaching in the 19th century was accompanied by cultural stereotypes that continue to influence what others expect of teachers and how teachers view themselves. According to feminist researchers, these cultural stereotypes are also perpetuated by social scientists whose perspectives on teachers reflect views of women in general.

For example, some sociologists (e. g., Dreeben, 1970; Geer, 1968; Lortie, 1975) have argued that women teachers lack a strong commitment to their work. They cite women's movement in and out of teaching to bear and raise children as evidence of low career commitment. They also assume that women have less stake than men in the economic rewards of teaching.

Teaching is considered an ideal job for women not only because it is compatible with family life, but because it draws on qualities thought to be associated with women--"the traditional womanly dimensions of nurturance, receptivity, passivity" (Lightfoot, 1978, p. 64). The historic emphasis in elementary teaching on character building rather than intellectual development is perpetuated in this idealized image.

Much research on schoolteachers takes these traditional images for granted and assumes that teaching, like other female occupations, appeals more to the emotions than the intellect (Simpson & Simpson, 1969). Jackson (1968) argues that elementary teachers exercise their feminine birthright when they base their actions on intuition and feeling rather than reason.

Teachers are not bound by this cultural imagery, and the political behavior of many teachers today defies the traditional stereotype. Still, there is

evidence that these expectations do affect the perspectives and behavior of many teachers. Hall (1982) found that, unlike men teachers, women teachers often played passive, submissive roles in contact with principals. "Even where principals built collegial relations with women teachers . . . they referred to faculty as 'the girls' or expected them to cook things for school gatherings" (p. 56). (See also the discussion of the relationship between mothers and teachers in Biklen, 1983 and Lightfoot, 1978.)

New Understandings of Women Teachers

New scholarship on women who teach is challenging old stereotypes by raising new questions and offering new frameworks for analyzing the lives of women teachers. In their focus on the meaning of work in women's lives, researchers seek to clarify why women teach and to examine the consistency and strength of their commitment to home and school.

The traditional concept of a career as a succession of related jobs arranged in a hierarchy of prestige does not fit the realities of teaching or the way teachers view their work. Generally, women do not have the luxury of concentrating on their careers in a single-minded way. The fact that women teachers have multiple commitments, however, does not necessarily mean that their work comes second (Hall, 1982). Some women integrate domestic and professional roles by choosing work that draws on characteristics and qualities traditionally associated with women (Bernard, 1974). Within a context of traditional assumptions about women and their roles, teachers could more easily integrate their commitments to home and work. For example, in country schools, teachers were allowed to bring small children with them, a flexibility that was lost in the move to consolidated and graded schools where such a practice was unthinkable (Nelson, 1981).

Biklen (1983) provides evidence of teachers' strong and consistent commitment to their work in her year-long study of women faculty in a respected New England school serving students from a variety of social classes. The teachers she interviewed did not follow the well-integrated, planned career path associated with professionals. Yet they often displayed a consistent commitment to teaching in their daily work, in their intense desire to return to teaching after periods at home with children, and in their disinterest in becoming principals.

> These teachers focused their energy on the content of the work, not on its use to them for upward mobility. Hence their major frustrations came, not when their hopes for advancement were crushed, but rather when they were forced to make compromises which they felt endangered their educational vision. (p. 44)

These findings underscore the need for a model that more accurately describes career commitment in a setting dominated by women.

The fact that many teachers feel a strong commitment to teaching does not mean that they identify proudly with their occupation. The social devaluation of teaching affects all teachers, even those who do not identify with the women's movement. The teachers in Biklen's study, for example, did not want teachers to be undervalued (or underpaid). They wanted the recognition that they worked hard at a challenging job and the status that such a reevaluation would bring. Many did not see that the status of elementary-school teaching was related to its association with young children.

Feminism has contributed to rising expectations for women, but the social image of teachers has remained the same or perhaps has even diminished. Once the job for ordinary men, teaching is now seen as ordinary work for ordinary women. With more women in the workplace, proportionally fewer are going into teaching. Those who do have a harder time feeling good about their occupational choice. If younger teachers had to do it over again, they say they

would pick a job with higher status and more pay (Biklen, 1983; Feistritzer, 1983; Lampert, 1981). This is not because young teachers dislike teaching. On the contrary, many love their work, but say it does not compensate for the costs in income and self esteem.

This review of the overlapping and often conflicting influences that shape the cultures of teaching underscores the difficulties of the job and the need to attract and retain capable indiv duals. A full appreciation of the impact of ecological demands, institutional expectations, and social forces should engender respect for teachers who do an excellent job and help explain why such people might want to leave teaching.

In this section, we did not try to be exhaustive, and much more could be said about the influence of other factors (economic, political, historical, and curricular) in shaping the cultures of teaching. For example, proponents of social reproduction theories view prevailing school norms and practices as mirrors of dominant social realities and as mechanisms for preserving them. From this perspective, social forces create teaching cultures in which teachers unwittingly perpetuate social inequities.

Taken together, these accounts leave little room for teachers to question the givens, make independent choices, and negotiate demands. While the literature on teachers socialization reviewed in the next section suffers from the same bias, research on teacher development assumes considerable teacher autonomy. Perhaps there is a middle ground where teachers can function as policy brokers (Schwille, Porter, Belli, Floden, Freeman, Knappen, Kuhs, & Schmidt, 1983), playing a role in determining how outside influences will shape what they do.

Acquiring the Cultures of Teaching

> People in a similar line of work are likely to share at least some common thoughts and feelings about that work. Such convergence can arise from the diffusion of a subculture. On the other hand, it may derive from common responses to common contingencies (Lortie, 1975, p. 162).

Although few thoughts and feelings are likely to be shared by all teachers, the existence of common perspectives, even within subgroups of teachers, calls for explanation. In the previous section, we considered accounts of how the contexts of teaching influence the cultures of teaching. In this section we consider how individual teachers acquire a teaching culture.

One can ask whether individual teachers learn these views (intentionally or unintentionally) from other educators or whether they come up with such views on their own. These alternatives suggest that some explanations will be based on the effects of socialization while others will be based on a process of development in individual teachers.

Teacher Socialization

Research on teacher socialization investigates the transmission of teacher beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, and values. Various definitions of socialization have been used, ranging from Merton's (Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957) inclusive definition that encompasses virtually all changes in teachers through any means (e. g., Zeichner, 1983), to narrower definitions that focus on how novice teachers, through interaction with experienced colleagues, come to hold the set of values or practices shared by that group.

Most studies of teacher socialization focus on student teaching and the first year of teaching, periods that are probably central to any process for passing on a teaching culture. During these periods, the novice imitates other teachers and learns from them about the acceptability of different ways of acting. Acquiring appropriate attitudes toward student discipline (e. g.,

Hoy, 1967, 1968, 1969; Hoy & Rees, 1977; Willower, 1968) is a widely described example. While experienced teachers seem overly strict with their students, new teachers may begin to imitate this model because they associate it with teaching success. At the same time, they may also experience disapproval by veteran teachers of their own more lenient approaches. Waller (1932) has written eloquently on this process, using the term "dignity" to refer to the authority role that teachers learn to maintain through interaction with their colleagues:

> Most of all is dignity enforced by one's fellow teachers. The significant people for a school teacher are other teachers, and by comparison with good standing in that fraternity the good opinion of students is a small thing and of little price . . . According to the teacher code there is no worse offense than failure to deport one's self with dignity, and the penalties exacted for the infraction of the code are severe. (p. 389)

Other groups have the potential to influence the novice, but none has been shown to play as large a role as experienced teachers. Although the formal power available to school administrators suggests their potential as powerful socializing agents (Edgar & Warren, 1969), the limited contact between teachers and principals usually limits their actual contribution (Burden, 1979; Grant & Zeichner, 1981; Isaacson, 1981). Typically the socializing power of the university is described as weak compared with the competing norms of schools; the argument that the effects of university socialization are washed out by school experience is described (but not endorsed) by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981). Fellow novices play a significant role in medical socialization (e. g., Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961), but they have received little attention in teacher education. Research on how student thought and action affect teaching and learning (e. g., Anderson, 1981; Doyle, 1977b; Weinstein, 1982) highlights the important role of pupils in determining

teacher behaviors (Applegate, et al., 1977; Doyle, 1979; Haller, 1967; Zeichner, 1983). This research tends to focus on teachers' adaptation to classroom press rather than on how teachers acquire the expectations pupils hold for them.

While the metaphors of molding and shaping provide vivid images of the process of teacher socialization, research in the past decade raises questions about whether experienced teachers abide by a single set of norms, whether new teachers change significantly, and whether they are merely passive recipients of a teaching culture. Because different groups of teachers share different norms, beginning teachers may not encounter a unified effort to socialize them. Other factors further limit the strength of socialization forces. Lortie (1975, Ch. 3) emphasizes the brevity of student teaching and the isolation of beginning teachers from their colleagues. He also argues that the absence of a technical subculture would reduce the impact of socialization even if there were more interaction among teachers.

There are also problems with the common assumption that the attitudes and values teachers acquire at the university conflict with those they encounter in schools. First, the belief that university programs endorse liberal values has not been tested (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Moreover, there is some evidence that university values are congruent with those encountered in schools (e. g., Bartholomew, 1976). Tabachnick, Popkewitz, and Zeichner (1979-80) found discrepancies between program rhetoric and the messages faculty give students in courses and in the field.

Not only are socialization pressures weak, but beginners are not easily changed (Lacey, 1977; Power, 1981; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1983). Following Lacey (1977), a number of researchers have focused on different ways students

and beginning teachers may respond to school and university norms. Teachers may conform to expectations, believing that those expectations are appropriate. Lacey calls this internalized adjustment. They may adjust their behavior to make it in line with expectations, but inwardly maintain reservations. He calls this strategic compliance. Finally, teachers may work to modify the expectations, strategically redefining the situation. Zeichner & Tabachnick (1983) found examples of all three strategies among the student teachers and beginning teachers they studied.

If one emphasizes the resistance of beginners to the effects of the workplace, one may underestimate the extent to which teaching culture is transmitted from one generation of teachers to the next. Those entering teacher preparation have already had more interactions with experienced teachers than they may ever have again. Twelve or so years of elementary and secondary school provide opportunities to receive messages about what teachers do. Moreover, as pupils, teacher education students were motivated to imagine what their teachers were thinking as a way of anticipating their actions and reactions. This "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) may have a potent, albeit undesirable, effect on teacher beliefs and values. There has been some research on the effect of this apprenticeship (Tabachnick, Zeichner, Densmore, Adler, & Egan, 1982) but little attention to the process itself. Wright & Tuska (1968) are an exception, but they focus on the psychodynamic effects of family experiences rather than on the unconscious modeling effects in the classroom.

Reconsideration of the power of teacher socialization is important in placing this approach to acquiring a teaching culture in perspective. The term "socialization" itself is neutral. While researchers sometimes describe the socialization goals of schooling positively (e. g., Prawat & Anderson,

1983), *teacher* socialization often has negative connotations. Those who study the process are seen as investigating the undesirable effects of the workplace (e. g., Hoy & Rees, 1977; Lacey, 1977; Popkewitz, 1979; Waller, 1932).

There are at least two explanations for these negative overtones. First, the value of socialization depends on the value attached to the norms of the group to which the individual is being socialized. Child socialization is viewed positively because of the value placed on the learned patterns of behavior. Those who study teacher socialization often find existing practices far from ideal (e. g., Popkewitz, 1979). They believe that existing practices emphasize management and order or support current social class structures, rather than their ideals of creativity, learning, and equity. The educational ideals of the researchers shape the way they interpret teacher change, just as the researchers' views of the ideal career shape the way they describe teachers' occupational commitment. Not surprisingly, these investigators see socialization as an undesirable process because it leads to the continuation of school practices they deplore.

The early literature on medical socialization provides an interesting contrast (e. g., Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957). Here the general value Americans place on the outcome of becoming a doctor gives the process of medical socialization a positive connotation, despite some lamentable features (e. g., that students decide what they need to learn to get by, rather than respecting their professors' views of what they need to know). As problems with current medical practices gain more attention, medical socialization is being viewed more critically (e. g., Freidson, 1970, 1975).

Teacher socialization might be viewed more favorably if it were looked at in the context of an exemplary group of teachers. For example, researchers

might endorse the socialization that occurs in one of the "successful" schools described by Little (1982), where the norms of colleagiality and experimentation prevail.

A second explanation for the undesirable connotations of socialization is that the process tends to portray the novice as a passive agent molded by outside influences. This image makes the teacher powerless, buffeted by forces beyond conscious control. Many educational researchers would prefer a more flattering image of the novice teacher as an active agent in the change process.

Models of Teacher Development

Like research on teacher socialization, research on teacher development seeks to describe and explain patterns of change in at least some sections of the teaching population. The term "development" connotes internally guided rather than externally imposed changes. The image of teachers actively directing their professional growth is an added attraction for some investigators. In this section, we discuss the study of teacher development in general, briefly describe three approaches to this study, then focus on the tradition that seems most capable of explaining changes related to the cultures of teaching.

In considering how studies of teacher development contribute to understanding the acquisition of teaching cultures, it is important to separate claims about existing patterns of teacher change from statements advocating particular teacher-education goals or techniques. Despite statements to the contrary (e. g., Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983, p. 31), implications for the proper aims of teacher education do not directly flow from descriptions of development. The final stage of development is not necessarily the desired

outcome of teacher education. Conversely, disagreement with the espoused developmental goals is not sufficient reason for rejecting the associated descriptions of patterns of change. Furthermore, because the links between developmental theories and recommended teacher-education practices are often tenuous, theoretical claims and practical suggestions must be evaluated independently. One can learn about teacher change from a description of the stages many teachers pass through, without accepting the associated recommendations.

Descriptions of teacher development make it tempting to stress instruction "matched" to a teacher's current stage. It is dangerous to assume, however, that observed patterns of change are the only ones possible, and even more dangerous to assume that instruction should be restricted to features central to a given stage. Just as theories of child development may serve to justify teaching practices that maintain children at their current levels of performance (e. g., Sharp & Green, 1975), theories of teacher development may lead to unwarranted acceptance of teachers' current performance.

At present, no full-blown theory of teacher development exists. The developmental approaches to the study of teacher change either stop short of linking developmental theory to teacher change or describe teacher change without offering an encompassing theory. These approaches do provide a useful contrast to socialization theories and to many conventional practices in teacher education.

At least three distinct approaches to the study of teacher development appear in the literature (Feiman & Floden, 1980): a model of changes in teacher concerns, a model based on cognitive-developmental theories, and a style of inservice education emphasizing teachers' own definitions of their needs. The first approach grows out of Fuller's (e. g., Fuller, 1969)

formulation of stages teachers pass through as they gain professional experience: a survival stage when teachers are preoccupied with their own adequacy, a mastery stage when teachers concentrate on performance and focus their concerns on the teaching task, and an impact stage when teachers become concerned about their effects on pupils.

A second approach, advocated by Sprinthall and his associates (e. g., Sprinthall, 1980; Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983) rests on theories of cognitive development. Teacher development is considered a form of adult development, and effective teaching, a function of higher stages. The changes considered important in this theory are described in terms of a progression through levels of ego, moral, and conceptual development as defined by Loevinger (1976), Kohlberg (1969), and Hunt (1974). In this progression, higher stages are characterized by "increased flexibility, differentiation of feelings, respect for individuality, tolerance for conflict and ambiguity, the cherishing of interpersonal ties and a broader social perspective" (Witherell & Erickson, 1978).

A third approach to teacher development, elaborated primarily by practitioners, is a style of inservice work informed by a view of professional learning as "mental growth spurred from within" (Devaney, 1978). Teachers' centers and advisory services offer a contemporary expression of this way of working (for historic parallels, see Richey, 1957), which emphasizes responding to teachers' own definitions of their learning needs, supporting teachers in their own directions of growth, and building on teachers' motivation to take curricular responsibility. In this context, teacher development is also often described in terms of stages, culminating in a teacher who takes responsibility for curricular decision making. There is a strong implication that teachers who reach the final stage will have responsive and diversified

classrooms where students have many opportunities to make choices about their learning.

Of these three, the changes described in the first approach most closely match our emphasis here on how teachers view their work. The second approach considers general changes in cognitive processes, rather than changes specific to teaching. While the third approach honors teachers' views, it is more an educational intervention than a description of teacher change.

Fuller's theory was motivated by her observation that many teachers go through the same pattern of change, acquiring a common perspectiv . In their first experiences leading classes, many teachers worry about whether they will survive. They try to discover the parameters of the school situation and to figure out where they stand. They wonder about their "abilities to understand subject matter, to know the answers, to say 'I don't know,' to have the freedom to fail on occasion, to anticipate problems, to mobilize resources and to make changes when failures reoccur" (Fuller, 1969, p. 220-221). They are most concerned about discovering and meeting the expectations of others. With experience, teaching concerns take over. Teachers worry whether they are presenting content appropriately, whether they are displaying the right skills, and whether they are maintaining good control over their classes. In the final stage, teachers are typically concerned about pupil progress and about their own contribution to student learning. Rather than trying to please others or to fit an externally prescribed model, they trust their own evaluation of their work. "Mature" teacher concerns include the ability to understand pupils' capacities, to specify objectives for them, to assess their gain, to recognize one's own contribution to pupils' difficulties and gains, and to evaluate oneself in terms of pupil learning (Fuller, 1969, p. 221).

Fuller explains the common developmental pattern of teacher concerns in terms of a general human tendency to be preoccupied with basic needs until they are satisfied. For beginning teachers, the most basic need is to survive. Until this need has been satisfied, concerns about student learning cannot emerge.

One problem with Fuller's description of teacher development is its generality. Presumably a teacher concerned about having students master grade-level facts and skills would be just as mature as a teacher concerned about having students become self-motivated learners. Fuller also has little to say about the factors that hinder or speed the disappearance of survival concerns or about why mastery concerns are followed by impact concerns (as opposed to concerns about salary or working conditions).

Efforts to relate research on teacher development, research on teacher socialization, and accounts of the genesis of teaching cultures could deepen understanding of how and why teachers change in particular ways. What, for example, is the relationship between overcoming survival and mastery concerns and learning the ecology of the classroom? Do new teachers exhibit Fuller's progression of concerns in schools where the norms of collegiality and experimentation prevail? How does the tension between the job and the work of teaching affect teacher development?

Conclusion

We conclude with a summary and analysis of what has been learned about the cultures of teaching, a discussion of implications for teacher education and educational policy, and suggestions for future research in this area.

What Has Been Learned

In many respects, descriptions of the cultures of teaching in Lortie (1975), Jackson (1968), and even Waller (1932), are still valid: Teachers use

little research-based technical knowledge; their rewards come from students rather than from the institution; and through interactions with administrators, parents, and other teachers they tend to express their desire to be left to themselves. Still, research in the last decade has challenged previous claims and assumptions.

Three challenges are particularly salient. First, the assumption that a uniform culture of teaching exists is now untenable. Even Lortie, who questions the existence of a shared teaching culture, tends to write as though all teachers follow certain norms (e. g., the prohibition against asking another teacher for advice). The recent work of Little (1982), Metz (1978), and Zeichner and Tabachnick (1983) repeatedly documents differences among cultures in different schools, and even differences among subgroups of teachers within a school (Metz, 1978; Parelius, 1980).

Second, the study of teaching careers using male professionals and businessmen as templates has not done justice to teaching, an occupation dominated by women. The primary importance of career ambition and single-minded devotion may be appropriate for some occupations, but these characteristics need not be desirable in all teachers. For example, it could be advantageous for successful teachers to continue working in the classroom rather than aspiring to administrative work.

Third, following the lead of several social-science disciplines, research on the cultures of teaching has begun to replace the image of a passive teacher molded by bureaucracy and buffeted by external forces with an image of the teacher as an active agent, constructing perspectives and choosing actions.

While it is encouraging that a decades' research has altered some research conclusions, one must ask whether the changes add to knowledge about the cultures of teaching or merely reflect changes in the cultures themselves.

If, as Cronbach (1975) puts it, "generalizations decay," what was true in 1950 may have been invalidated by social changes. How much of what has been learned in the last decade will itself be invalidated in another decade? Historical perspective can place conclusions about the cultures of teaching in a proper light. Though educational research generally focuses on change and its antecendents, recent historical studies show that some characteristics of classrooms have been remarkably stable (e. g., Cuban, 1984). The recent shifts in career opportunities for women will almost certainly affect the cultures of teaching, as will schemes for merit pay if they are widely adopted.

Implications for Teacher Education and Educational Policy

What has been learned about the cultures of teaching suggests that policies and practices related to induction programs, reward structures, and teacher preparation should be reexamined.

The heterogeneity of teaching cultures makes the prospects for school change more hopeful. While academicians tend to bemoan the powerful school culture that reduces the aspirations and energies of all teachers to mediocrity, sc'ool cultures are not uniform. The fact that some are inspiring, not demoralizing, shows what is possible even without major structural changes. Acknowledging differences among schools also underscores the importance of placement in the induction of prospective and beginning teachers.

Feminist perspectives on the cultures of teaching require rethinking how school districts treat teachers. For example, recent policy initiatives to address the absence of rewards in teaching may be misguided in their exclusive focus on increases in merit pay and opportunities for career advancement. These solutions assume that teachers place most value on the extrinsic rewards of money and power. In fact, many teachers may value increased opportunities

for collegial interaction or job sharing. The point is to offer an array of rewards that will meet teachers' needs.

Seeing teachers as active agents rather than passive workers suggests a different role for teachers in school and district policy. Consistent with some of the loose-coupling literature on policy implementation (e. g., Elmore, 1983), it suggests that policy should seek to build and strengthen teachers' abilities to make good educational decisions, rather than seeking to control every detail of their lives. This change in mode of working with teachers would elevate their status within the educational system and perhaps increase a district's ability to attract and hold capable teachers.

Consideration of teachers' tacit knowledge suggests a shift in the balance between teacher *education* and teacher *training*. The success of behaviorally oriented research on teaching encourages a technical-skills approach in teacher preparation and renewal. Though technical skills are valuable, research on the cultures of teaching suggests that much of what teachers know does not fit the means-ends statements that summarize process-product research on teaching. Teacher education must build on (or rebuild) what teachers (and teachers-to-be) already believe about their work. Perhaps the scales should also be tipped to restore respect for the craft aspects of teaching (see, e. g., Tom, 1984).

The Future of Research on the Cultures of Teaching

Two striking things about research on the cultures of teaching is (1) how little there is and (2) how hard it is to do. The dominance of behaviorist psychology in American educational research in this century may partly explain the fact that meanings, perspectives, and beliefs have only recently become respectable objects of study. The problem of making inferences about beliefs

and knowledge was one factor that led to the flight to behaviorism. While the benefits of behaviorism proved too costly, the complexities of cognitive research have not vanished.

Research on the cultures of teaching is labor intensive--observations and interviews take considerable time to conduct and analyze. Even well-supported studies can seldom go beyond a small sample of teachers. The variation in teaching cultures limits the generality of conclusions from any one study. Finally, the relationship of teaching cultures to the social systems of school, community, and society makes a multidisciplinary approach particularly fruitful. Unfortunately, multidisciplinary research cuts across the grain of academic disciplines.

A wide range of topics still need attention. The existence of heterogeneity in teaching cultures has been documented, but researchers have barely begun to describe this variation systematically. Important cultural differences may be associated with age, experience, teaching philosophy, gender, social class, school norms, location, subject matter, and grade level.

There is much speculation but little evidence on the role that teachers' organizations play in shaping the cultures of teaching. Teachers' perceptions of the proper role of such organizations would be important information for school boards, the general public, and the organizations themselves. The work of Mitchell and his associates (Mitchell & Kerchner, 1983; Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, & Pryor, 1981) suggests that teachers' organizations have produced basic changes in teachers' views of their job; this deserves further investigation.

Research on teachers' knowledge has just begun. Increased understanding of what this knowledge is like, how it develops, and how it is used should clarify the place of specialized and ordinary knowledge in teaching.

Finally, the recently publicized change in the characteristics of those entering teaching deserves special attention. Many have speculated that new career opportunities for women have robbed teaching of some of its best members. Research is needed to investigate the degree to which this change in entering members has affected the cultures of teaching.

Whatever topics are investigated in the next decades, the opportunity now exists to bring a variety of research methods to bear on questions about the cultures of teaching. Recent work provides models for the use of case studies, observation, videotapes, and interviews. The educational research community currently supports multidisciplinary inquiry. That support is particularly appropriate for enlarging the scope and relevance of research on the cultures of teaching.

References

Amarel, M., & Chittenden, E. (1982, June). A conceptual study of knowledge use in schools. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Anderson, L. M. (1981). Student responses to classroom instruction (Research Series No. 109). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 626)

Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Applegate, J., et al. (1977). The first-year teacher study. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 766)

Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Drifferton, England: Nafferton.

Becker, H. (1952). The career of the Chicago public school teacher. American Journal of Sociology, 57, 470-477.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. New York: Methuen.

Bernard, J. (1974). The future of motherhood. New York: Penguin Books.

Biklen, S. K. (1983). Teaching as an occupation for women: A case study of an elementary school. Syracuse, NY: The Education Designs Group.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Buchmann, M. (1983a). Argument and conversation as discourse models of knowledge use (Occasional Paper No. 68). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Buchmann, M. (1983b). Role over person: Justifying teacher action and decision (Research Series No. 135). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Buchmann, M. (in press). The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. American Journal of Education. (Also available as IRT Research Series No. 71. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.)

Burden, P. R. (1979). Teachers' perceptions of the characteristics and influences on their personal and professional development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 5404-A. (University Microfilms No. 8008776)

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum: An interview study of teachers' understandings. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Charters, W. W., Jr. (1963). The social background of teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cohen, E. G. (1973). Open-space schools: The opportunity to become ambitious. Sociology of Education, 46, 143-161.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 116-127.

Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms: 1890-1980. New York: Longman.

Cusick, P. A. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Devaney, K. (1977). Essays on teachers' centers. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Devaney, K. (1978). On delivering staff development. Staff Development Newsletter. Austin, TX: Professional Development Association.

Doyle, W. (1977a). Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Doyle, W. (1977b). Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 5). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Doyle, W. (1977c). The uses of non-verbal behaviors: Toward an ecological model of classrooms. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 23.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. Theory into Practice, 18, 138-144.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1977). The practicality ethic in teacher decision making. Interchange, 8(3), 1-12.

Dreeben, R. (1970). The nature of teaching. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Edgar, D. E., & Warren, R. L. (1969). Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 42, 386-399.

Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 4-11.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. New York: Nicols.

Elmore, R. F. (1983). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 342-369). New York: Longman.

Elsbree, W. S. (1939). The American teacher. New York: American Book Company.

Feiman, S., & Floden, R. E. (1980). A consumers guide to teacher development. Journal of Staff Development, 1(2), 126-147.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1983). The American teacher. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications.

Fiske, E. B. (1983, October 4). Teacher fulfillment put above pay. The New York Times, pp. 17-18.

Fountain, P. A. J. (1975). What teaching does to teachers: The teacher as worker. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 2446B. (University Microfilms No. 75-24, 529)

Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Boles, K. (1983). Teaching: An imperilled "profession." In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 261-299). New York: Longman.

Freidson, E. (1970). Profession of medicine. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

Freidson, E. (1975). Doctoring together: A study of professional social control. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental characterization. American Educational Research Journal, 6, 207-226.

Gallup, G. H. (1983). The 15th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 33-47.

Geer, B. (1968). Occupational commitment and the teaching profession. In H. S. Becker, B. Geer, D. Riesman, & R. S. Weiss (Eds.), Institutions and the person. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gitlin, A. (1983). School structure and teachers' work. In M. W. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Grant, C., & Zeichner, K. (1981). Inservice support for first-year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14, 99-111.

Hall, D. A. S. (1982). Teachers as persons: Case studies of the lives of women teachers. Warrensburg, MO: Central Missouri State University, Department of Sociology.

Haller, E. J. (1967). Pupil influence in teacher socialization: A socio-linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 40(4), 316-33.

Hoekter, J., & Ahlbrand, W. D. (1969). The persistence of the recitation. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 145-167.

Hoffman, N. (1981). Woman's "true" profession: Voices from the history of teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(1), 23-26.

Hoy, W. (1967). Organizational socialization: The student teacher and pupil control ideology. Journal of Educational Research 61, 153-155.

Hoy, W. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 77, 257-265.

Huberman, M. (1983). Recipes for busy kitchens: A situational analysis of routine knowledge use in schools. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 4, 478-510.

Hunt, D. (1974). Matching models in education. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Isaacson, N. (1981). A description of the nature and extent of support systems as perceived by beginning secondary teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 8, p. 3566A, Univ. Microfilms.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Johnson, S. M. (1982). Teacher unions and the schools. Cambridge, MA: Institute for Educational Policy Studies, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Kaestle, C. F. (1983). Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society: 1780-1860. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kerr, S. T. (1983). Teacher specialization and the growth of a bureaucratic profession. Teachers College Record, 84, 629-651.

Kirst, M. (1983). Teaching policy and federal categorical programs. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 426-448). New York: Longman.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.

Lampert, M. (1981). How teachers manage to teach: Perspectives on the unsolvable dilemmas in teaching practice. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3122A. (University Microfilms No. 8126203)

Lampert, M. (in press). Teaching about thinking and thinking about teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies.

Leonard, G. (1983, May). Car pool. Esquire, 99(5), 58-64, 66, 70-73.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools. New York: Basic Books.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The lives of teachers. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 241-260). New York: Longman.

Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lortie, D. (1973). Observations on teaching as work. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mann, D. (1976). The politics of training teachers in schools. Teachers College Record, 77, 323-338.

McPherson, G. (1972). Small town teacher. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merton, R. K., Reader, G. G., & Kendall, P. L. (1957). The student physician. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Metz, M. H. (1978). Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Milofsky, C. (1976). Special education: A sociological study of California programs. New York: Praeger.

Mitchell, D. E., & Kerchner, C. T. (1983). Labor relations and teacher policy. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 214-238). New York: Longman.

Mitchell, D. E., Kerchner, C. T., Erck, W., & Pryor, G. (1981). The impact of collective bargaining on school management and policy. American Journal of Education, 89, 147-188.

Mitchell, D., Ortiz, F., & Mitchell, T. (1982). Final report on controlling the impact of rewards and incentives on teacher task performance. Riverside, CA: University of California.

Nelson, M. K. (in press). From the one-room schoolhouse to the graded school: Teaching in Vermont, 1910-1950. Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies.

Nemser, S. F., & Applegate, J. H. (1983). Teacher centers. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed.). Riverside, NJ: Macmillan.

Newberry, J. (1977, April). The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 299)

Newman, K. K. (1978). Middle-aged experienced teachers' perceptions of their career development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 4885A. (University Microfilms No. 79-02,196).

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. Psychological Review, 84, 231-259.

Parelius, R. J. (1980, September). Faculty cultures and instructional practices. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University, Department of Sociology, New Brunswick, NJ.

Plihal, J. (1982, March). Types of intrinsic rewards of teaching and their relationship to teacher characteristics and variables in the work setting. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1979, April). Teacher education as socialization: Ideology or social mission. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Power, P. G. (1981). Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 25, 288-296.

Prawat, R. S., & Anderson, L. M. (1983). Responsibility in the classroom: A synthesis of research on teaching self-control. Educational Leadership, 40, 62-66.

Richardson, J. G., & Hatcher, B. W. (1983). The feminization of public school teaching. Work and Occupations, 10, 81-99.

Richey, H. (1957). Growth of the modern concept of inservice education. In Nelson B. Henry, Editor, Inservice education for teachers, supervisors and administrators. The 56th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part I. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ross, J. A. (1980). The influence of the principal on the curriculum decision of teachers. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12, 219-230.

Ryan, K. (1970). Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Schwab, J. J. (1959). The "impossible" role of the teacher in progressive education. School Review, 62, 139-159.

Schwille, J., Porter, A., Belli, G., Floden, R., Freeman, D., Knappen, L., Kuhs, T., & Schmidt, W. (1983). Teachers as policy brokers in the content of elementary school mathematics. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 370-391). New York: Longman.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. (1975). Education and social control: A study in progressive primary education. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sieber, S. D. (1981). Knowledge utilization in public education: Incentives and disincentives. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), Improving schools: Using what we know. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Silver, C. B. (1973). Black teachers in urban schools. New York: Praeger.

Simpson, I., & Simpson, R. (1969). Women and bureaucracy in the semi-professions. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, and social workers. New York: Free Press.

Skylar, K. (1973). Catherine Beecher. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom: An analysis toward a general theory of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sprinthall, N. A., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner: A cognitive-developmental view. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development 82nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sprinthall, N. (1980). Adults as learners. In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Sugg, R. S., Jr. (1978). Motherteacher: The feminization of American education. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Sweet, J. A., & Jacobsen, L. A. (1983). Demographic aspects of the supply and demand for teachers. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 192-213). New York: Longman.

Sykes, G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 97-125). New York: Longman.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K. M., Densmore, K., Adler, S., & Egan, K. (1982, March). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a moral craft. New York: Longman.

Travers, R. M. W. (Ed.). (1973). Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Russell & Russell.

Weatherly, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 171-197.

Weinstein, R. S. (Ed.). (1982). Students in classrooms (special issue). The Elementary School Journal, 82(5).

Willower, D. J. (1968). The teacher subculture. Samplings, 1, 45-59.

Wise, A. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Witherell, C. S., & Erickson, V. L. (1978). Teacher education as adult development. Theory into Practice, 17, 229-238.

Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Wright, B. D., & Tuska, S. A. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 76, 253-293.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983, March). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. Paper presented at the conference "First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?" Austin, Texas: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. M., & Grant, C. A. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers: A re-examination of the pupil control ideologies of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 7, 298-314.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1983, April). Teacher perspectives in the face of institutional press. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.